

# CITY OF HAYWARD AGENDA REPORT

AGENDA DATE
AGENDA ITEM

<u>09/17/02</u> \_\_\_\_\_

**WORK SESSION ITEM** 

TO:

Mayor and City Council

FROM:

Director of Public Works

SUBJECT:

Authorization for the City Engineer to Issue a Grading Permit to C&G

Contractors, Inc., for the Slide Repair of the Cul-de-sac at Vista Greens Court

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the attached resolution finding the negative declaration adequate and complete and authorizing the City Engineer to issue Grading Permit.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The site is a cul-de-sac, located at Vista Greens Court in Tract 3492, consisting of townhouses constructed in 1973. In June, the Vista Greens Homeowners' Association, which maintains the site, requested that a contractor - C&G - correct a landslide, which occurred within the cul-de-sac (see Exhibit A). C&G applied for a grading permit to fix the landslide.

Repair of the landslide involves establishing a keyway, as a base to stabilize the slope, at the toe of the slope below the cul-de-sac. A subsurface drain will be placed in the bottom of the keyway, located in a manner that provides easy, gravity flow to an adequate discharge system.

Fill placement will commence upon completing the keyway excavation and subdrain construction. Benching into the hillside will be constructed to maintain a proper base for the fill. To prevent erosion during the rainy season, all exposed surfaces of fill slope will be planted with deep-rooted native plants after completion of the slope grading. The proposed grading should protect the site from further landslides. City staff has reviewed the proposed plan and determined that it is in conformance with the geotechnical report and proper engineering practices.

A staff-conducted environmental evaluation resulted in a negative declaration (Exhibit B) and staff recommends its approval. Before a grading permit is issued for work on a site with a slope greater than 20 percent, the Grading Ordinance specifies that the grading permit must first be approved by the City Council. The average slope of the site is approximately 51 percent.

Grading can be completed in approximately 20 working days, and done without causing a nuisance to the general public. The permit will allow grading only between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, with no weekend or holiday work. Additionally, no work will be allowed during the rainy season (October 15 to April 15). Immediately following the grading, the slope will be stabilized with vegetation or other methods.

Prepared by:

Robert A. Bauman, Deputy Director of Public Works

Recommended by:

Dennis L. Butler, Director of Public Works

Approved by:

Jesus Allmas, City Manager

Exhibits: Exhibit A: Vicinity Map

Exhibit B: Negative Declaration

Exhibit C: Grading Plan




Exhibit A

### **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Notice is hereby given that the City of Hayward finds that no significant effect on the environment as prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended will occur for the following proposed project:

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION: I.

Grading Permit GR PW 2002 0005: C & G Contractors Inc., (Applicant) - Request to grade an existing cul-de-sac to repair a landslide.

The site is located at Vista Greens Court.

FINDING PROJECT WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT ENVIRONMENT: II. The proposed grading of the site, as conditioned, will have no substantial effect on the area's resources, cumulative or otherwise.

#### III. FINDINGS SUPPORTING DECLARATION:

- The grading permit application has been reviewed according to the standards and 1. requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and an Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist has been prepared with a determination that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment.
- There is no evidence of historical or archeological resources within the project. 2.
- The Hayward Fault does not pass near the property, and the property is not 3. located in the "Earthquake Fault Zone."
- The proposed grading will not create significant impacts related to changes in 4. topography, water quality, or site drainage.
- Installation of sub-drain pipes will enhance the stability of the slope. 5.
- Positive dust-control methods approved by the City Engineer, which will be 6. utilized at all times during grading, will preserve air quality.
- 7. No endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats were observed during a field investigation on July 19, 2002, by City of Hayward Engineering and

IV.	PERSON	<b>WHO</b>	<b>PREPARED</b>	<i>INITIAL</i>	STUDY:
-----	--------	------------	-----------------	----------------	--------

Exhibit B				
Date				
James B. Lear, Associate Civil Engineer				
PERSON WHO PREPARED INITIAL STUDY:				
Transportation staff.	City 0	i ilaywaid	Liightering	an

#### COPY OF INITIAL STUDY IS ATTACHED

For additional information, please contact the City of Hayward, 777 "B" Street, Hayward, California 94541-5007 or telephone the City Clerk at (510) 583-4400.

#### Distribution

- Provide copies to all organizations and individuals requesting same in writing.
- Send to project applicants.
- Reference in all public hearing notices are to be distributed 20 days in advance of initial public hearing and/or published once in the Daily Review (20 days prior to the hearing or if no other public notice, otherwise 10 days; reference in all Notices of Decision distributed 20 days prior to effective date of decision).

#### **Posting**

This Notice is to be posted for a period of at least 20 days, until Wednesday, August 21, 2002:

- 1. At the City Clerk's Office, Bulletin Board, Fourth Floor
- 2. At the Hayward City Hall, Information Center, First Floor
- 3. In the City Library branches.

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

Project title Grading Permit GR PW 2002 0005	
Lead agency name and address: <u>City of Hayward, 777 "B"</u>	" Street, Hayward, CA 94541-5007
Contact persons and phone number: <u>James B. Lear</u>	(510) 583-4785
Project location: Vista Greens Court, Hayward, CA 9454	41
Project sponsor's name and address:	
C & G Contractors, Inc.	
2256 Dunn Road, Hayward, California, 94545	
(510) 785-3410	
General plan designation Low Density Residential Zoni	ng: Residential District
<b>Description of project:</b> Grading Permit GR PW 2002 0005	: C & G Contractors, Inc., (Applicant) –
Request to grade an existing cul-de-sac, to repair a landslide.	
The site is located at Vista Greens Court.	
Surrounding land uses and setting:	
The site is bounded to the north and east by residential housing, t	to the south and west by open land.
Other public agencies whose approval is required Not	Applicable
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECT	ED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially a	
one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated	by the checklist on the following pages.
☐ Land Use and Planning ☐ Transportation/Circulation ☐ Production ☐ ☐ Production ☐	☐ Public Services ☐ Utilities and Service Systems
☐ Population and Housing ☐ Biological Resources ☐ Geological Problems ☐ Energy and Mineral Resour	=
Water Hazards	Cultural Resources
☐ Air Quality ☐ Noise ☐ Mandatory Findings	Recreation
of Significance	

## **DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the basis of this initial evaluation: $\boxtimes$ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there П WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Date

For

City of Hayward

Signature

Printed Name

James B. Lear

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:** Potentially Significant Potentially Unless Less Than No Impact Significant Mitigation Significant Impact Incorporated Impact LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal: a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? Comment: The property is designated as residential district. The proposed grading to repair the existing slide is consistent with this designation. Impact: No impact. b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? Comment: The project is not in conflict with environmental plans or policies adopted by the City or other government agencies. Impact: No impact. c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? Comment: The proposed use is compatible with residential land uses in the vicinity. Impact: No impact. d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? Comment: The site is not zoned for agricultural uses. Impact: No impact.

Comment: The project will not disrupt the physical arrangement of existing residential development. The site to be graded is to repair on existing landslide Impact: No impact.

established community (including a low-income or

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an

minority community)?

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
Comment: The proposed project is for grading and repairs the existing and slide only.  Impact: No impact.				
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				
Comment: See II a.				
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?				
Comment: See II a.				<del></del>
III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a) Fault rupture?				$\boxtimes$
Comment: The property is outside the Earthquake Fault Zones. The site is located approximately 0.80 miles from the Hayward fault.  Impact: No impact.	t .		· <b></b>	
b) Seismic ground shaking?				$\boxtimes$
Comment: There already exists the potential for strong ground shaking at the site, due to the proximity of the site to the major active faults capable of generating significant earthquakes. The repair does not affect this impact.  Impact: No impact.				
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?				$\boxtimes$
Comment: This area is not known to have the potential for seismic ground failure, including liquefaction.  Impact: No impact.				<b>ل</b> ــــــــكا
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?				
Comment: Not known in this area.  Impact: No impact.				<del></del>

e)	Landslides or mudflows?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	Comment: Grading the site during rainy season poses a greater risk, as it may be disastrous to the property because of the possibility of heavy rains during construction increasing the instability of the slope, and eventually creating a major landslide on the property. No grading will be permitted on this site during the rainy season (October 15 to April 15). Grading will be done in conformance with the recommendations contained in the soils report prepared by Terrasearch Inc., dated May 27, 2001, Project No. 9093.G. Copy of the soils report is on file in the Engineering and Transportation Library.  Impact: Less than significant impact				
f)	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?				
	Comment: The proposed grading is to restore the slope to the original grades.  Impact: No impact				
Mag)	Subsidence of land?				
	<u>Comment</u> : Area is not known for this condition. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
h)	Expansive soils?				$\boxtimes$
	Comment: The boring test number 3 is characterized with mottled brown and orange sandy, silty, clay, some gravel, moist, medium to stiff Af. at a depth of 0'to 5'. At a depth of 5' to 10', grades brown, moist, medium grades light tan and at a depth 10' to 19' light tan with orange streaks sandy silty, clay, hard, moist (weathered bedrock?).  Impact: No impact.				
i)	Unique geologic or physical features?				
	<u>Comment</u> : No unique geologic or physical features exist. <u>Impact</u> : No impact				

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	Comment: The proposed project will install subdrain trenches and perforated pipes at the back of the keyway.  Impact: Less than significant impact.				
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?				
	Comment: This area is not located in a designated Flood Plain.  Impact: No impact.				
c)	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not discharge into surface waters or affect surface water quality. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
d)	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not affect the amount of surface water in any body of water. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
e)	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?				
	Comment: The project will not affect water currents, direction, or course of water movements.  Impact: No impact.				
f)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of ground water recharge capability?				
	Comment: The project will not affect the quality of ground water. There is no ground water at elevation 19 feet, and the construction activity is above the existing water table.  Impact: No impact.				

a)	Altered direction or rate of flow of ground water?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g)	Comment: The project will not affect the rate of flow of ground water.  Impact: No impact				
h)	Impacts to ground water quality?				
	Comment: The project will not affect the ground water quality.  Impact: No impact.				
i)	Substantial reduction in the amount of ground water otherwise available for public water supplies?				
	Comment: The project will not affect the amount of ground water otherwise available for public water supplies.  Impact: No impact.				
v.	AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
	Comment: The project will be required to implement dust control measures during construction.  Impact: No impact.				
b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
c)	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change of climate.  Impact: No impact.				

d)	Create objectionable odors?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	Comment: This proposed grading would not create objectionable odors.  Impact: No impact				
VI	.TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not create a significant impact to the nearby intersection.  Impact: No impact.				
b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not create hazards to safety from design features.  Impact: No impact.				
c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?				
	Comment: The project does not affect emergency vehicle access.  Impact: No impact				
d)	Insufficient parking capacity onsite or offsite				$\boxtimes$
	Comment: The project does not require parking.  Impact: No impact.				
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?  Comment: The proposed grading will not result in hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.  Impact: No impact.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f)	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
g)	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?				
	Comment: No conflicts exist.  Impact: No impact.			•	
VI	I. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to				
a)	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?				
	Comment: No wildlife exists on the landslide area. Impact: No impact.				
b)	Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? <u>Comment</u> : The site does not contain locally designated species. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
c)	Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?				
	Comment: The site does not contain locally designated natural communities.  Impact: No impact.				
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?				
	<u>Comment</u> : No wetland habitat exists on the site. <u>Impact</u> : No Impact.				
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The site is not located within a wildlife dispersal or migration corridor. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a)	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not conflict with adopted City of Hayward energy conservation plans. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
b)	Use nonrenewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not use nonrenewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.  Impact: No impact.		,		
c)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?				
	Comment: No known resource would be significantly affected by this proposed grading.  Impact: No impact.				
IX	. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:				
a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?				
	Comment: The proposed project will not involve a risk of accidental exposure or release of hazardous substances. Impact: No impact.				
b)	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
	Comment: The project does not have the potential to interfere with emergency response or evacuation plan. Impact: No impact.				
c)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?				
	Comment: The proposed project will not create a health hazard or a potential health hazard. Impact: No impact.				

d)	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
e)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not increase fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees Impact: No impact				
X.	NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Increases in existing noise levels?				
	Comment: A temporary increase in noise will occur during the grading of the site. However, hours of grading are regulated by the City of Hayward Noise Ordinance and the impact will be minimal. The completed project will not create noise levels that are above the noise level for the area.  Impact: Temporary; the duration of grading operation.				
b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				
	Comment: People will be exposed to an increase in noise levels during the grading of the site, however, the exposure to grading noise is temporary. People will not be exposed to severe noise levels.  Impact: Temporary grading noise; not to reach severe noise levels.				
XI	.PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:				
a)	Fire protection?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not require fire protection. Impact: No impact.				

b)	Police protection?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not require police protection from the Hayward Police Department <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
c)	Schools?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not generate more school age children than what is already anticipated by the Hayward General Plan. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
d)	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not affect the maintenance of public facilities.  Impact: No impact.				
e)	Other government services?				
,	<u>Comment</u> : No other services are impacted. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
XI	I. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities?				
a)	Power or natural gas?				
	Comment: No power or natural gas required for the proposed grading.  Impact: No impact.				
b)	Communications systems?				
	<u>Comment</u> : No communication facilities required. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
c)	Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?				
	<u>Comment</u> : Existing Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities will not be impacted. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
d)	Sewer or septic tanks?				
	Comment: Sewer or septic tanks will not be impacted. Impact: No impact.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Storm water drainage?				
	Comment: Existing facilities are adequate to accommodate the proposed grading.  Impact: No impact.				
f)	Solid waste disposal?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading will not affect the solid waste disposal <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
g)	Local or regional water supplies?				
	Comment: Local or regional water supplies will not be affected.  Impact: No impact.				
ΧI	II. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal?				
a)	Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed grading is not located near a scenic vista or scenic highway. <u>Impact</u> : No impact.				
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.  Impact: No impact.				
c)	Create light or glare?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not result in a new source of light or glare.  Impact: No impact.				
XI	V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a)	Disturb paleontological resources?				
	Comment: The proposed grading is located in an area not known for paleontological resources.  Impact: No impact.				


		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Disturb archaeological resources?				
	Comment: The proposed grading is located in an area not known for archaeological resources  Impact: No impact.				
c)	Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique cultural values?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not affect cultural values.  Impact: No impact.				
d)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?				
	Comment: Religious or sacred uses are not known to occur on this site.  Impact: No impact.				
XV	V. RECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?				
	Comment: The proposed grading will not increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.  Impact: No impact.				
b)	Affect existing recreational opportunities?				$\boxtimes$
	Comment: See XV a Impact: No impact.				
XV	VI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a)	quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California History or				
	prehistory?	-			


b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short- term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?		
	goals?		
c)	but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future		
	projects)		
d)	Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either		
	directly or indirectly?		

### XVII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

None.

- a) Earlier analyses used. None.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed. None.
- c) Mitigation measures. Conditions of approval of Grading Permit GR PW 2002 0005.





# DRAFT

#### HAYWARD CITY COUNCIL



RESOLUTION NO	
Introduced by Council Member	

RESOLUTION FINDING THE NEGATIVE
DECLARATION ADEQUATE AND
COMPLETE AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY
ENGINEER TO ISSUE GRADING PERMIT
GR PW 2002 0005 TO C&G CONTRACTORS, INC., FOR
THE SLIDE REPAIR OF THE CUL-DE-SAC AT VISTA
GREENS COURT

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Hayward hereby finds that the Negative Declaration is complete and adequate for said project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Hayward that the City Engineer is hereby authorized and directed to issue on behalf of the City of Hayward Grading Permit GR PW 2002 0005 to C&G Contractors, Inc., for the Slide Repair of the Cul-de-sac at Vista Greens Court.

IN COUNCIL, HAYWARD, CALIFORNIA, 2002
ADOPTED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:
AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: MAYOR:
NOES: COUNCIL MEMBERS:
ABSTAIN: COUNCIL MEMBERS:
ABSENT: COUNCIL MEMBERS:
ATTEST:
City Clerk of the City of Hayward
APPROVED AS TO FORM:
City Attorney of the City of Hayward